

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	CATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/898,532		07/02/2001	Raymond C. Wallace	000195		
23696	7590	06/30/2005		EXAMINER		
Qualcomm	Incorpor	rated	HONG, HARRY S			
Patents Dep 5775 Moreh		re	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Diego,	CA 9212	21-1714	2642			
				DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/898,53	32	WALLACE ET AL.					
Office Ac	tion Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Harry S. H	ong	2642				
	DATE of this communic	ation appears on the	cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	lress			
THE MAILING DATE  - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS from  - If the period for reply specified. If NO period for reply is specified by the Company reply received by the Company reply received by the Company reply received.	ATUTORY PERIOD FO OF THIS COMMUNIC on the mailing date of this communicated above is less than thirty (30) scified above, the maximum statuet or extended period for reply with the communication of t	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenication. days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the apply	ent, however, may a reply be tirutory minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed vs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this continuous (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
Status								
1) Responsive to	communication(s) filed	on <u>02 July 2001</u> .						
2a) This action is F	INAL. 2b	)⊠ This action is n	on-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims			•					
4a) Of the abov 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is 7) ☐ Claim(s)		withdrawn from cor						
Application Papers								
10)⊠rThe drawing(s) Applicant may no Replacement dra	n is objected to by the filed on <u>02 July 2001</u> is of request that any objection wing sheet(s) including the laration is objected to be	dare: a)⊠ accepted on to the drawing(s) be the correction is require	e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFF				
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119							
a) All b) So  1. Certified  2. Certified  3. Copies of application	nt is made of a claim forme * c) None of: copies of the priority do copies of the priority do f the certified copies of on from the International	ocuments have bee ocuments have bee the priority docume al Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicati ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cit	ed (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
	Patent Drawing Review (PT0 tatement(s) (PT0-1449 or P		Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/898,532 Page 2

Art Unit: 2642

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKivergan (US 6,329,953; cited and applied for the first time) in view of Wallace et al. (Wallace; US 6,208,841 B1; cited by the applicants and applied for the first time).

McKivergan plainly teaches the testing chamber of claims 1-8 and the apparatus of claims 9-20 to evaluate a wireless communication device. See Figure 6 and column 4, line 29 – column 7, line 60. The <u>only</u> difference between the claimed invention and McKivergan is that McKivergan uses an array of Probe Elements controlled by a Probe Array Controller positioned on the inner wall instead of the claimed antennas. However, Wallace teaches the use of an array of antennas to evaluate a wireless communication device. Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the Probe Elements of McKivergan with the antenna array of Wallace in order to evaluate the wireless communication device in a more controlled environment of McKivergan.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4785. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-4788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/898,532

Art Unit: 2642

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry S. Hong Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2642

June 26, 2005